EXHIBIT 3

Case 1:04-cv-00414-SLR Document 135-4 Filed 08/26/2008 Page 2 of 9

Cas	1:04-cv-00414-SLR	Document 135-4	Filed 08/26/2008	Page 3 of 9
1	APPEARANCES:			
2				
3	MARTIN & WILSON, P.A. BY: JEFFREY K. MARTIN, ESQ. and			
4		TIMOTHY J. WI	LSON, ESQ.	
5		Counsel for P	Plaintiffs	
6				
7				
8	CONN	OLLY, BOVE, LO	DGE & HUTZ, LLP	
9	BY:	MATTHEW F. BO	YER, ESQ.	
10		-and-		
11				
12		E & ROSENTHAL ARTHUR M. BREV	WER, ESQ. and	
13		ERIC HEMMENDIN (Baltimore, Ma	NGER, ESQ. aryland)	
14				
15	Counsel for Defendants			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
.				

1	(REPORTER'S NOTE: The following is an excerpted			
2	transcript of the Direct Examination of Joseph Garrison.)			
3	BY MR. MARTIN:			
4	Q. All right. Doug Lynch. You said he came out to the			
5	farm?			
6	A. Yes. Doug Lynch, he came out to the farm. He said,			
7	Joe, I need to talk to you. I heard something about this			
8	lawsuit thing. And			
9	MR. BREWER: I would object, your Honor.			
10	Hearsay.			
11	THE COURT: See if you can guide folks around			
12	it.			
13	MR. MARTIN: I'm sorry, your Honor?			
14	THE COURT: See if you can guide folks around			
15	the hearsay.			
16	MR. MARTIN: This is an admission from a party			
17	opponent.			
18	THE COURT: The party opponent?			
19	MR. MARTIN: Mr. Lynch is speaking on behalf			
20	of			
-21	THE WITNESS: Yes.			
22	MR. MARTIN: of Mountaire.			
23	MR. BREWER: Your Honor, in addition to being			
24	hearsay, it's also not relevant. I mean, what the			
25	conversation is about has nothing to do with the lawsuit.			

1 THE COURT: Rephrase the question and let's see. 2 MR. MARTIN: Okay. 3 BY MR. MARTIN: You had a conversation with Mr. Lynch out at the farm? 4 Q. 5 Α. Yes. 6 Q. He came out to see you at the farm? 7 Α. Yes, he did. 8 Q. Okay. And what specifically did you discuss? 9 Α. Well, he came to me to ask me about the lawsuit. He 10 heard about it. 11 Q. What lawsuit are you talking about? 12 MR. BREWER: Your Honor, objection. 13 THE WITNESS: Mountaire lawsuit. Overtime. 14 MR. BREWER: Could you ask him to stop answering 15 the question while the objection is pending? 16 THE COURT: All right. I don't know where we're 17 going with this. 18 MR. MARTIN: May we have a quick sidebar? 19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 (Sidebar conference held as follows.) 21 MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, Mr. Brewer is well aware that Mr. Garrison testified that by way of deposition, 22 that Doug Lynch came out to him on the farm and said, talk 23 about the overtime claim and said, don't sign any papers. 24 25 We know we owe you some money. We just don't know how much.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, I don't understand any bars to the admissibility of that testimony given that this is a manager who is speaking about this particular claim that's being made.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, the problem is that I certainly don't recall knowing about this, quote unquote, admission. I don't know whether it was addressed in Mr. Lynch's deposition, so how is it that the defendants can possibly refute this? I mean, it is classic hearsay.

MR. MARTIN: Well, your Honor, respectfully, I believe it's an exception here. And as I said, this testimony has been on the record since 2005. We can take a break. I can show it to the Court.

THE COURT: Well, you know, this is the problem, is that the reason you all are supposed to be to be communicating with each other is there are not supposed to be surprises. We are supposed to resolve these problems before a witness gets on the stand.

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, this is not a surprise.

MR. BREWER: Your Honor, it clearly is a surprise. Mr. Martin never mentioned this to me. When he refers to this being on the record, the record he's referring to is a deposition, which, as you know, are

extremely -- it's limited. There is no objection filed. It's classic hearsay. There's no way I can refute this.

THE COURT: Honestly --

MR. BREWER: It's very prejudicial.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that. I'm trying to think about what -- well, I am disconcerted that, once again, we're having an evidentiary dispute in the middle of testimony when my rules are supposed to present it, and I don't know whether Mr. Garrison's deposition was taken before or after Mr. Lynch's. I don't know whether anyone has had -- the defendant has had a full and fair opportunity in discovery to refute this and to present contrary evidence. I just don't know.

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, I will represent, again, this deposition testimony from Mr. Garrison was 2005. They've had now three years to present this and refute this. Quite frankly, I expected that this would be -- come up in Mr. Lynch's trial testimony, knowing that he would not be here live.

MR. BREWER: Let me suggest, if Mr. Martin wanted to raise it in Mr. Lynch's trial testimony, he certainly was present and cross-examined Mr. Lynch in his video deposition. Mr. Martin never raised any question about this at all during that entire time.

Secondly, there is absolutely no way that

1.6

anybody could have foreseen that Mr. Martin is going to ask a question like this, which he should know is hearsay and highly prejudicial at this point in trial. And the first I hear about it for the first time this morning.

MR. MARTIN: Your Honor, Mr. Lynch did have an opportunity to refute this because his deposition was taken after Joe Garrison, in 2005.

THE COURT: Well, the bottom line is that knowing that this was going to be -- well, it is hearsay. I don't believe it is an admission because there's no way for me to determine whether it was actually said because there's no other evidence except this witness.

If you had brought this to my attention ahead of time, maybe we could have resolved it, but I am not taking any more time. The objection is sustained.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ MARTIN: Your Honor, may I put on the record the proffer?

THE COURT: Yes. This is the time to do it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Martin is prepared to testify
Mr. Lynch approached him on the farm and to discuss the
overtime lawsuit. He specifically asked Mr. Garrison not to
sign any papers. He further acknowledged that the company
did owe him, Mr. Garrison, overtime, but they had not
computed how much.

Furthermore, they said that Mr. Lynch told